

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are pending. In the present amendment, Claims 1 and 2 are currently amended and new Claims 3-6 are added. Support for the present amendment can be found in the original specification, for example, at page 4, line 28 to page 5, line 1, and at page 5, lines 12-14. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Desyatov (Russian Patent No. 2057647).

In response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 1 and 2 are hereby amended to cure the issues cited in the Office Action. In view of amended Claims 1 and 2, it is believed that all pending claims are definite and no further rejections on that basis are anticipated. However, if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with the Examiner in a joint effort to derive mutually acceptable language.

Turning now to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection and traverse this rejection, as discussed below.

Amended Claim 1 recites:

A method for production of a sandwich panel core from composites, the method comprising:

placing of a blank from a reinforcing material;

impregnating the blank with a binder along a full surface of the blank to obtain a prepeg;

hardening the binder during hot-pressing;

obtaining a plane semifinished-blank comprising a set of substantially rigid parts detached from each other and having a shape of core sides;

after deformation of the semifinished-blank, obtaining a core relief with required geometries; and

final hardening of the binder, wherein a heat supply for hardening the binder in the prepreg is applied within boundaries of said parts, and conditions slowing down the hardening along the prepreg between said parts are created.

The method described in amended Claim 1 improves the shaping accuracy of the sandwich panel and improves the folding of a plane blank into a 3-D structure. It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest each feature recited in amended Claim 1.

Desyatov describes a method of corrugated filler forming from composite material. The method is performed by coating a flat fabric sheet with a binder on sections of the sheet which form side faces. The binder is then solidified while the sheet is flat, with the sheet deforming according to the cell profile. Next, saturation of the unsolidified zones occurs followed by a final solidification.

However, it is respectfully submitted that Desyatov does not disclose or suggest “final hardening of the binder, wherein a heat supply for hardening the binder in the prepreg is applied within boundaries of said parts, and conditions slowing down the hardening along the prepreg between said parts are created,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Instead, Desyatov simply recites a “final solidification of the article” in its Abstract. Desyatov does not disclose or suggest any further details regarding the final solidification. Further, as stated in the original specification at page 2, lines 17-21, the main shortcoming of Desyatov which the current invention cures is the impossibility of executing discrete binder

application onto a preliminarily marked-out fabric plane sheet along the parts corresponding to folded type core side ridges when using thin fabrics.

Additionally, according to the original specification at page 2, lines 22-28, because the material of the prepreg reinforcing base in Desyatov has a capillary-porous structure, when applying the binder onto the parts corresponding to the side ridges in the folded structure in Desyatov, the binder may penetrate to areas of the bending lines. Thus, in the next shaping stage when applying heat to the blank, the active hardening of the binder will also occur in the areas of the bending lines. This will result in a reduction of mobility of the blank along the bending lines and will impede the process of transforming the blank into a 3-D structure. The method described in Claim 1 improves the process of Desyatov by supplying the heat for hardening the binder in the obtained prepreg only within the boundaries of the rigid parts.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 1, and Claim 2 which depends thereon, as anticipated by Desyatov be withdrawn.

New Claims 3-6 are added by the present amendment. Support for new Claims 3-6 can be found in the original specification, for example, at page 4, line 28 to page 5, line 1, and at page 5, lines 12-14. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added. Additionally, new Claims 3-6 are dependent on Claim 1, and are thus believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new Claims 3-6 further patentably define over the cited reference.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Adnan H. Bohri
Registration No. 62,648

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)